DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 088 EC 132 513

AUTHOR	Finell, Janet; And Others
TITLE	Regular Education Inservice Training Program. Final Report, June 1, 1979-May 31, 1980.
INSTITUTION	Long Island Univ., Brooklyn, N.Y. Brooklyn Center, Zeckendorf Campus.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
BUREAU NO	451CH90214
PUB DATE	Aug 80
GRANT	G007901258
NOTE	89p.; Print may be poor in parts.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Attitude Change; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Mainstreaming; Program Effectiveness; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The report describes a project to train 35 regular class teachers, principals, and counselors to work with handicapped children. Training included 5 seminars on such topics as attitudinal factors, early identification, individualized education programs, and working with parents; monthly followup sessions; on site consultations; and preparation of audiovisual training materials using videotapes. Analysis of pre- and posttests of the Attitude Toward Handicapped Individuals Scale and the Rucker-Gable Educational Programming Scale indicated that the training had a significant impact on the attitudes of project participants, participants' work with mainstreamed children, and participants' influence on other school personnel involved in mainstreaming. Qualitative data in anecdotal form is presented to support the effectiveness of the program and point out areas of need, including lack of bilingual teachers, slowness with which children are evaluated and placed, and lack of support services. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED201088

Institute for Mainstreaming Inner-City Handicapped Youngsters

Department of Guidance & Counseling

Long Island University, Brooklyn, New York

Regular Education Inservice Training Program

June 1, 1979 - May 31, 1980

Janet Finell, Ph.D., Project Director
Robert Nathanson, Trainer
Jeffrey Lambert, Trainer

Jo Fine, Ph.D. and Howard Spivack, Ph.D., Evaluators

FINAL REPORT

August, 1980

This project was supported by a grant from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education.
Grant No. G007901258; Project No. 451CH90214

EC132513

Table of Contents

	Page
OVERVIEW	1
PROBLEMS, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	
Introduction	2
Legislative Background and the Implication of PL 94-142	4
The Need for Training in District 13	9
Attitudes Toward the Handicapped and the Roles of School Personnel	12
Goals and Purposes of this Project	17
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES	
Introduction	20
Rationale for and Purpose of the Training	21
Participants	23
Description of the Training	
Approach to Training	25
Training Seminars	25
Monthly Follow-Up Seminars	34
On-Site Visits to Participants	35
Individualized and Small Group Study	37
EVALUATION	
Methodology	37
Quantitative Data	38
Qualitative Data	43
Results	
Quantitative Data	43
Qualitative Data	61

Table of Contents (Cont.)

DISCUSSION..... 70

REFERENCES..... 73

APPENDIX..... 76

Overview

On May 29, 1979, the Brooklyn Center of Long Island University was awarded a one year grant from the Bureau of Education of the Handicapped/Office of Education to train regular school personnel to work with mainstreamed children in Community School District 13 of New York City. The design of this project resulted from the expectation that in accordance with the mandates of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142), increasing numbers of handicapped children in District 13 would be integrated into "least restrictive" educational settings.

Participants in this project were 35 regular educational personnel including teachers, assistant principals, and a guidance counselor, who would be working with handicapped students during the 1979-1980 school year.

The major features of the training program included:

1) Five full-day training seminars covering topics such as attitudinal factors, early identification and evaluation, working with parents, and curriculum and resources;

2) Monthly follow-up sessions led by Brooklyn Center educators addressed to specific problems that arose in participants' work with mainstreamed children;

3) On-site visits by Brooklyn Center educators to offer consultative assistance to individual project participants who were working with mainstreamed students; and

4) Preparation of audio-visual training materials using videotapes.

To assess the effectiveness of the project, evaluation data were collected using scores on two attitudinal scales, principals' ratings of participants' schools, participants' evaluation of the project, and teachers' ratings of the adjustment of their mainstreamed handicapped students to the regular classroom setting.

The procedures, activities, and results of this project will be disseminated through written reports to appropriate agencies, lectures at faculty conferences, talks at parents meetings, articles describing the project and through distribution of training materials on videocassette.

It was the expectation of Brooklyn Center, Long Island University educators and District 13 staff that this project would favorably affect large numbers of personnel, parents and children, and that the 35 participants would serve as a training base for far greater numbers of District 13 personnel.

It was further anticipated that this project would mark the beginning of a continuing relationship between Community School District 13 and The Brooklyn Center which will result in vastly improved services for increasing numbers of mainstreamed handicapped children.

Problems, Goals and Objectives

Introduction

In accordance with the policy of the Chancellor and the Director of Special Education of the New York City Public Schools, Community School District 13 and The Brooklyn Center of Long Island University, each located in the Fort Greene Section of Brooklyn , were informed that they might collaborate on this project. Their collaboration involved a direct relationship between the school district and the university, and this project was designed jointly by District 13 educators and Brooklyn Center staff.

This project was planned with the help of the Director of Special Education Services at The Brooklyn Center of Long Island University. The university was in a unique position to work with District 13 and to offer the assistance of its staff and resources because it has had a long-standing federally funded program, directed by Professor Robert Nathanson, which services severely handicapped college students. Furthermore, the Department of Guidance and Counseling, which offered the course given to participants, historically has recognized the needs of the surrounding community. Many of its courses are geared toward current problems and needs in the area of guidance and counseling.

Although District 13 encompasses some affluent and middle class areas, children from more affluent homes tend to attend private schools. Therefore, the public school population of District 13 is by no means representative of the potential public school age population of the district.

District 13 encompasses the areas of Bedford-Stuyvesant and Fort Greene within its boundaries. A majority of the families in these sections of Brooklyn are economically disadvantaged. Large numbers of the residents receive public assistance, large numbers of people are at or below the poverty level, and a sizeable proportion of the households are headed by women. The problems of Bedford-Stuyvesant have received nationwide attention and the poverty of this area as well as the neighboring Fort Greene area is quite extreme.

Community School District 13 services 19,000 children who are representative of these poverty conditions. Of these 19,000 students, 16,200 are entitled to free lunches, an additional

indicator of the low income level of the families of District 13 children. In addition to the problems associated with poverty, a large number of the school age children in this district also must cope with the problems which accompany handicapping conditions. Of the 19,000 children in this district, 10% or 1,900 have been identified as handicapped and have been serviced by special education teachers.

The implementation of PL 94-142 requires that these handicapped children be integrated into activities with non-handicapped children whenever possible. However, implementation of PL 94-142 cannot prove successful in this already overburdened community unless regular education personnel (REP) receive special training in the needs of handicapped children. This program, therefore, involved Regular Education Inservice training for teachers, counselors, administrators and other support personnel so that large numbers of handicapped children can be successfully mainstreamed, in accordance with the mandates of the Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.

Legislative Background and the Implication of PL 94-142

The passing of PL 94-142 represents an attempt by Congress to redress the untenable educational situation of the handicapped in America. As of 1975-1976, "only 38% of the 6.7 million handicapped in this country were enrolled in adequate programs"(Phelps and Halloran 1976). The passing of PL 94-142 was a unique act according to Martin (1976) in that rather than leave public education policies up to the discretion of the states, a federal mandate now exists which insists "that state and local school systems

establish policies of providing free public school education for all of America's handicapped children by September of 1978" (p. 133). Its mandates involve even greater changes than the Education of the Handicapped Act of 1974 (PL 93-380) in calling for free appropriate education for all handicapped children, assurance that their rights are protected, assistance to states and local districts in providing this education, and a call for ways to assess the effectiveness of educational efforts for the handicapped (Irvin, 1976). Also called for by Congressional legislation is the establishment of annual state plans which include "activities to identify every handicapped child, study his or her individual needs, and prescribe in detail educational expectations and requirements" (Jones, 1976, p. 138).

The Annual New York State Plan indicates that as of 1978-1979, over 12,000 special education teachers were needed to provide full educational opportunities for the handicapped population, age 0-21, in New York. However, since many of the students formerly in special education will be mainstreamed as PL 94-142 is implemented, more regular educational personnel who receive special training to service the exceptional child are needed. The Annual State Plan also shows that within the New York State Education Department, efforts are being made to develop voluntary inservice training, develop and implement parent training, and increase bilingual education programs for handicapped children. Finally, the state report points to the need for the development of overview courses in teacher-preparing colleges and universities on the handicapped. Thus, the philosophy and goals of this project

reflected both the Congressional legislation and the New York State Annual Plan that call for efforts to provide effective public school education in the framework of respect for individual rights and needs. Implicit in the legislation cited above is the urgent need to redress educational policies that have denied public school education to many handicapped children in the past, and the recognition that segregated education for the handicapped has led to discriminatory practices that prevent handicapped people from realizing the development of their full potentialities in American society.

The language of PL 94-142 calls for education in the "least restrictive educational environment." As Phelps and Halloran (1976) note, the law requires that "to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped learners be educated with non-handicapped students" (p. 36). With the exception of students whose handicaps are so severe that special classes or schools are necessary, handicapped children are to be educated in regular classes with supplementary services and assistance provided as necessary. Also called for in PL 94-142 is the guarantee of due process procedures, the development and maintenance of the Individual Educational Plan for the exceptional student, non-discriminatory testing and evaluation, and the protection of confidentiality regarding student records.

It is expected that in the coming years, more and more mildly handicapped students will be mainstreamed in accordance with the new law. As this occurs, regular educators who have no prior experience or training in special education will be faced with the responsibility for the education of children for whom they are ill-prepared.

Further evidence of the need for training in New York City can be found in the New York City Board of Education's response to the Lora Decision. Action was brought against the Board of Education asserting that the placement of Isaac Lora in a Special Day School for emotionally handicapped students violated the student's statutory and constitutional rights. The plaintiffs claimed that the assignment of "Isaac Lora, as member of a class representing all Black and Hispanic students currently assigned to Special Day Schools (Formerly called '600' schools) for Emotionally Disturbed Students in New York City had a racially discriminatory effect on Black and Hispanic children." Plaintiffs further claimed that these schools isolate students in a racially segregated system and do not provide them with suitable instruction. They further charged that their due process rights were violated by the Board of Education's failure to hold the appropriate hearings mandated by law and to reevaluate students in such schools in order to determine whether they were able to return to regular schools. Placement in Special Day Schools was described as being in violation of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 by affording "only inadequate educational opportunity" and thereby discriminating against the handicapped.

On June 2, 1978, Federal District Court Judge Weinstein held that:

> (1) the process of evaluating students to determine if they should enter the 'special day schools' violated students' right to treatment and due process; (2) to the extent that students were referred to largely racially segregated schools, there was a denial of equal educational opportunity in violation

> of Title VI and (3) New York City's monetary problems did not excuse violation of the students' rights.
>
> (From New York City Board of Education Memorandum)

On July 2, 1979, Judge Weinstein issued a decree ordering inservice training for all school personnel. New York City Board of Education Chancellor Macchiarola responded to the decree by instituting emergency measures to familiarize New York City Board of Education personnel with the mandates of PL 94-142 and the implications of the Lora Decision. This issue has had the effect of sensitizing New York City personnel to the important issues involved here and may be related to the overwhelming interest expressed by New York City educators in The Brooklyn Center's work in this area of inservice training.

A recent lead article in the New York Times has also helped to publicize the issues concerning special education and racial/cultural discrimination. On Sunday, September 16, 1979, the Times addressed itself to the issue of placement of Hispanic students in classes for mentally retarded students. The article described such students as

> six-hour retardant(s) - normal children who, because of linguistic problems and cultural differences, are treated as if they were mentally disabled during the school day (New York Times, p.1, 66).

The shortage of bilingual educators has contributed to youngsters being "wrongly classified as retarded over the years." They quoted Carmen Perez, president of the NationalAssociation for Bilingual Education, as estimating that at least "25 percent of Hispanics in classes for the retarded were there in error."

The article found that most of those misclassified Hispanic students were in New York City's Puerto Rican community, and a lawsuit is now pending against the Board of Education regarding this issue.

The Lora Decision and the Times article point to the desperate need for intensive, well-planned and direct education in regard to the needs of bilingual/bicultural students in the New York City schools. Among the many issues this project addressed were those involving the detrimental effects of labeling, the misclassifying of minority students, and meeting the special needs of Bilingual/Bicultural youngsters who are handicapped. The importance of non-discriminatory evaluation, placement and treatment also were emphasized in the training program.

The Need for Training in District 13

As noted earlier, of the approximately 19,000 students in Community School District 13, 10% or 1900 students were enrolled in special education classes. Of 19,000 students in the District, approximately 70% are Black and 28% are Hispanic. Among the 1900 identified handicapped students, approximately 88% are Black, while 12% are Hispanic. Eight per cent of the 1900 handicapped students in District 13 (over 150 students) are Non-English speaking, but none of the special education staff of District 13 is bilingual. Although there are 72 bilingual teachers who work in this district, none of them had any training in special education. Only a small proportion of the Non-English speaking handicapped students were receiving remedial reading instruction twice weekly

from an itinerant bilingual remedial reading teacher. The services the Non-English speaking handicapped students were receiving clearly were inadequate. By training bilingual personnel in the special techniques required to work effectively with handicapped students, services for those Non-English speaking students who would eventually be mainstreamed would be greatly improved.

PL 94-142 had already made an impact on District 13 before the start of this project. As of fall 1978, 14 students were recertified as no longer needing special education services and were placed in regular education classes. While it was not within the scope of this project to determine how these children, formerly in CRMD and emotionally handicapped classes, were adjusting to regular education classes, it was conceivable that problems had developed. These children, now in classes with an average register of 32, were placed with teachers having no special education training and were no longer receiving the attention that they previously had in special education classes with registers of 10 or 12.

It was anticipated that as of September 1979, greater numbers of children in District 13 would be similarly moved out of special education into regular education classes either on a part-of-the-day or full-day basis. During this transition period, it was important for regular educators to gain some understanding of the special needs of children with handicaps, to be trained to work with parents, and to become familiar with the materials, community resources, and special curricular needs of the handicapped.

Attitudes Toward the Handicapped and the Roles of School Personnel

The trepidation and reluctance which one might expect to be present in regular educators as they anticipate the entry of handicapped children into their classes or schools is not surprising when one considers society's attitudes toward the handicapped. Attitudes of the public towards the handicapped have been found by researchers to be both stereotyped and negative (Richardson et al, 1961; Yuker, 1965). Research findings have demonstrated that teacher attitudes toward the handicapped are similarly negative (Guskin, 1963; Murphy et al, 1960; Warren and Turner, 1966).

Although teacher attitudes appeared to be stable over time as shown by Zucker and Meyen, (1975), several investigations in which teachers were exposed to a course of study on the handicapped demonstrated that attitudinal change occurred. Shaw and Gillung (1975) found that after a three credit summer session course dealing with special education programs, administrative arrangements and classroom management regarding the handicapped, the attitudes of 10 regular classroom teachers on the Rucker-Gable Educational Programming Scale, which measures attitudes about the placement of handicapped students, became significantly more positive. A follow-up testing on this scale three months after completion of the study indicated that attitudes had remained positive. Similar findings were obtained by Harasymiw and Horne (1976). Their study was conducted with 191 teachers who were working in an urban school setting where

handicapped students were partially or fully mainstreamed. Special education teachers were retrained by educators from six universities as generic specialists who worked with regular classroom teachers on the management of the newly mainstreamed handicapped children. In addition to the support of the newly retrained generic specialists, the classroom teachers also participated in workshops dealing with conceptual, interpersonal and technical factors regarding mainstreamed handicapped students. As predicted, the regular classroom teachers became significantly more positive in their attitudes toward integration of the handicapped as measured by a questionnaire developed by these researchers.

In an article, Cocrane and Westling (1977) argued that as PL 94-142 is implemented, the support of the school principal will be critical for successful mainstreaming. Among the skills the principal should have in order to provide successful leadership in the school are familiarity with the characteristics of mildly handicapped children and the ability to provide information on the education of exceptional children. In cases where the handicapped child is only partially mainstreamed, the principal should be able to utilize special educators as support personnel for the regular classroom teacher. Of great importance is the principal's familiarity with and utilization of community resources for the handicapped and his/her support for the faculty. School personnel should be encouraged to educate normal children about handicaps and their effects on the handicapped individual, and the principal's support in such education is invaluable.

In their book on guidance, counseling and support services, Foster et al (1977) documented in great detail the important role the school counselor plays in the adjustment of the handicapped child both in the special and regular educational setting. Moreover, these authors addressed themselves to the many difficulties that handicapped children and their parents frequently experience in a society that often fears and avoids the individual who is different. Foster points out that the self-attitudes developed by the handicapped may in time become more of a handicap than the actual disability itself.

In his review of recent changes in the education of the disabled, New York Times reporter, Edward B. Fiske (1979) reviewed the mandates involved in the federal legislation and some of the problems associated with implementation of the law. Concerning the Individualized Education Program, Fiske found that "compliance is mixed (p. 13, col.3)." He reported that Richard Cortright, National Education Association's representative of the law found that some school districts were merely "sending forms home for the parents to sign," and that drawing up the IEP was not always the collective task it is supposed to be.

Fiske found mainstreaming to be workable with children with normal intelligence, e.g., the learning disabled and physically handicapped. However, teachers opposed the mainstreaming of disruptive students, and those who posed "classroom management problems." In particular, resistances to the mainstreaming of

retarded students and those with emotional and social difficulties were cited.

"Mainstreaming has become the number one concern of public school teachers," (Fiske, p. 8E), and teachers have expressed "concern, frustration and resentment" to it. Fiske found that most school districts are slowing their push to mainstreaming until their teachers are better trained to cope with it. He quotes Michael Norman, associate director of the National Association of State Directors of Special Education:

> There's a lot of misinformation around. The point of 'least restrictive environment' is not to force every handicapped kid into a regular classroom. The point is to look at every kid individually. (quoted by Fiske)

Another writer who addressed himself to difficulties with mainstreaming is Chapin (1978). He cited studies which found evidence of "significant social rejection of handicapped children within regular classrooms (p. 22)." A rigid approach to placement can lead to feelings of failure, humiliation and isolation on the part of the handicapped child, whom he felt might feel more emotionally secure and accepted in a "separate, supportive environment (p. 23)." He recommended a slow and gentle transition in the process of mainstreaming, and like Michael Norman and writers cited earlier in this chapter, emphasized the importance of individual program planning.

These articles indicate that implementation of the law presents difficulties and that teacher resistance is a substantial

concern. This writer suggests that effective and appropriate inservice training would clarify some of the confusion regarding mainstreaming and the implementation of PL 94-142, and more effectively prepare regular education personnel to work successfully with handicapped children.

It would seem to follow from the research and writing cited above that a course of study that would prepare not only teachers, but also administrators, counselors and other support personnel for work with the handicapped could help to overcome the attitudinal barriers and lack of knowledge that may endanger the success of mainstreaming. Important goals of this project were to increase familiarity with the needs of the handicapped and the services available to them, and to develop the ability of educators to create an environment in which handicapped students will be accepted by their non-handicapped peers. It was hoped that through the training of personnel, interaction in the classroom between handicapped and non-handicapped youngsters would serve to reduce some of the attitudinal barriers that have created social distance between these two groups in American society. Implementing ways through which these attitudinal barriers can be ameliorated, and enabling mainstreaming to become a positive experience both for handicapped and non-handicapped individuals, were the overall goals of this project. Through the discovery of the strengths of handicapped peers, non-handicapped students' attitudes might become more positive than they would otherwise be if these two groups continued to

exist in isolation from one another. Of essential importance, too, would be the contribution that mainstreaming can make to the self-esteem of the handicapped youngster who may come to learn, under the guidance of well-trained and accepting school personnel, that he or she can interact positively with non-handicapped peers in a regular classroom setting and be capable of accomplishing many of the same tasks that the non-handicapped can accomplish.

Goals and Purposes of this Project

As noted earlier, the 14 youngsters who were originally mainstreamed in District 13 were placed in regular education classes staffed by teachers without special training in working with the exceptional child. Nor were the counselors and other school personnel who were serving these 14 children trained in any of the special techniques needed for effective work with this group. As the numbers of mainstreamed children were to increase substantially by September of 1979, school administrators were concerned about the possible resistance to mainstreaming by regular educators. It was felt that such resistance, if not dealt with effectively prior to mainstreaming, might further contribute to the existing problems of handicapped children in the district. Consequently, District 13 sought the assistance of Long Island University, Brooklyn Center, Department of Guidance and Counseling. This department, with the assistance of The Brooklyn Center's Special Educational Services Program, as well as experts in the field of special education, was already working to facilitate the adjustment of handicapped children

entering the educational mainstream. In addition to the joint work of District 13 administrators and Brooklyn Center staff, a planning conference was held on October 12, 1978, at which regular and special education teachers as well as parents of exceptional children in District 13 joined in the planning of this project.

The primary focus of this project was the training of Regular Educational Personnel who were working with District 13 mainstreamed children. Training addressed attitudinal factors, curricular planning for the special needs child, familiarity with community resources for the exceptional child, identification of handicapping conditions in early childhood, and familiarity with evaluatory tools including culture-fair tests. In addition, understanding the physical bases behind a limited number of handicapping conditions, utilizing the Individual Educational Plan, and learning techniques for enlisting parental involvement in the education of the handicapped child were considered.

Another goal of the proposed program was the opening up of lines of communication between special education and regular education personnel in District 13. While special educators work under the auspices of the Bureau of Special Education and are therefore centralized in contrast to regular educators, both special educators and regular educators serve children from the same district. In cases where handicapped children cannot be mainstreamed for the total school day, special educators and

regular educators would be serving the same students. In other cases, mildly handicapped students would be placed for the entire school day in regular education classes. In both situations, open communication between the regular and the special educators would best serve each child's needs. At the beginning of this project, there was little communication between special and regular educators in District 13 to the detriment of the children already mainstreamed. This communication gap could prove to be an even greater problem when greater numbers of handicapped children are mainstreamed in the years ahead. This project therefore addressed itself to the ways in which the lines of communication between special and regular educators can be opened and maintained to the benefit of mainstreamed children in District 13.

Finally, it was hoped that the effects of the proposed program would not be limited to project participants. This project therefore incorporated ways in which the learnings of participants directly involved in the project would reach staff who were not directly involved. In this way, larger numbers of staff would become aware of the results of this project. Participants in this workshop would serve as a training base for colleagues not included in the workshop. An anticipated outcome would be a gain in knowledge and a lessening of stereotypical attitudes toward the handicapped.

To summarize, major goals and objectives of this project were as follows:

1) To provide regular education personnel with knowledge, techniques, methods and materials that should enable

them to work successfully with mainstreamed handicapped students.

2) To provide experientially-based training through continued supervision of and consultation with participants in seminars at which special education personnel are involved, and through on-site consultative visits to them in their schools.

3) To assist and supervise participants in disseminating project learnings in their schools, and to meet with non-participants in order to increase understanding of and interest in mainstreaming.

4) To address racial and cultural stereotyping in training personnel in a school district in which a large majority of the special education students are Black and Hispanic.

5) To increase acceptance of children with handicapping conditions, and to provide participants with a better sense of their own feelings, thoughts, and behavior as they relate to handicapped youngsters.

6) To improve the academic and social progress and adjustment of mainstreamed children in regular education settings.

7) To increase cooperative assistance of parents of mainstreamed children in the educational and social development of their children.

8) To develop materials - written and videotaped - which can be widely disseminated.

9) To provide a model of a program that can be utilized by other educators.

Methodology and Procedures

Introduction

This section will detail the methodology and procedures designed to meet the problems, goals and objectives discussed above. "The Institute for Mainstreaming Inner-City Handicapped Youngsters" (Brooklyn Center, Long Island University), addressed itself to the overall goals of training regular education personnel

(REP) in a non-degree certification program so that they would be better able to effectively implement the mandates of PL 94-142. The program provided a model that can be replicated, included plans for evaluation and widespread dissemination, and was planned in cooperation with administrators, supervisors, teachers, and parents from New York Community School District 13. In addition, several Special Education administrators and supervisors from the New York City Board of Education participated in the planning.

The goals of this project which address themselves to the single component Regular Education Inservice were in accordance with the Annual Plan prepared by the New York State Department of Education.

Rationale for and Purpose of the Training

The inservice training for regular educators conducted by project staff fits the category described by Yarger (1976) as the free partnership inservice program. The partnership refers to the one between The Brooklyn Center of Long Island University and District 13. This partnership was entered into voluntarily and reflected a response on the part of the university and the local school district to changing educational needs. The why for the inservice training in terms of teacher motivation can best be described in the words of Howey (1977):

> As a response to more dramatic changes in society, and in turn schools which mandate role reorientation or redefinition -- system related...
>
> as a means of changing role or responsibilities --

> career progression...
>
> as a process of understanding and enhancing the person in a professional role -- personal development (p. 32).

In planning inservice training, project developers worked in accordance with the model of Hite (1977), wherein step 1 involves defining one's purposes; step 2 analyzing limits, and step 3 designing program components.

Thus, the overall purpose of this training reflected the changing role and need for professional development in regular educators to accommodate exceptional mainstreamed children. Mainstreaming involves changes in the school system as well as in the roles of school personnel, and calls for personal development on the part of the personnel involved. Thus, in response to changing educational needs mandated by PL 94-142, Brooklyn Center educators and District 13 administrators defined the purpose of their partnership as the education of regular education personnel to work with mainstreamed children, analyzed the limits of their plan by limiting the inservice training to 35 individuals, and involved parents in the design of this program.

Participants were trained in a variety of tasks which included development of special techniques for working with parents of handicapped children, interpreting and utilizing Individual Educational Plans, and identifying and referring to the proper agency children with handicaps who were not previously identified as such. Whenever possible, tasks were specific, i.e., the interpretation of an actual Individual

Educational Plan, so that the participant would be well prepared to work with the exceptional child through having gained familiarity with the necessary tasks and techniques in the training.

Participants were expected to develop a variety of competencies through this training. Included among them are the ability to gear the curriculum to the special needs of the exceptional child and the parents, the ability to hold productive and growth-enhancing conferences with parents of the exceptional child, and an awareness of attitudinal factors that might interfere with positive interaction between the mainstreamed child and his or her peers. Of great importance, to, was the participant's ability to enhance the social adjustment of the mainstreamed child.

Participants

Participants were drawn from regular teachers, counselors, administrators and other support personnel from Community District 13. These participants were selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1. volunteering to work with mainstreamed handicapped youngsters;
2. regular assigned status (as opposed to substitute or temporary status) in the district;
3. ability to serve as resource people who can train, in time, other personnel in their district;
4. willingness to speak at Parent Association and faculty meetings;
5. expectation that they will have years of service ahead of them in their district;

6. their reputation for cooperativeness, leadership, skill, and effectiveness as regular education personnel.

Priority was given to bilingual educators servicing exceptional children, since, as noted earlier, 8% of the special education children in the district are bilingual but were not under the care of bilingual personnel.

Recruitment for participants was undertaken primarily through letters describing the project which were sent out to district personnel. Considerable assistance in recruitment was provided by Mr. Joseph Paladino, District Supervisor of Guidance, who sent out memos to principals in the District, spoke to teachers, and helped screen candidates to select the most qualified staff who would represent minority students and be expected to disseminate the program. In addition, an attempt was made to cover as many different schools in the District as was possible.

Interest in inservice training also was sparked when the New York Post and New York News published articles describing the Brooklyn Center's program. (See Appendix.) These articles resulted in phone and mail responses to the Department of Guidance and Counseling at the Brooklyn Center.

The 35 participants selected for training represented 14 elementary and junior high schools in District 13. Thirty-two of the participants were teachers. Of this number, six were bilingual teachers, one each taught Reading, Science, Language Arts and English, while the remaining teachers taught at a

specific grade level (ranging from first to sixth). Of the other three participants, two were Assistant Principals and one was a Guidance Counselor. Two-thirds of the participants represented the major minority groups living within the district.

Before the project began, 29 of the 35 participants indicated that they already had worked with children having various handicapping conditions. Of the six without prior experience, there was the expectation that they would be working with these children during the year of the project.

Description of the Training

Approach to training. Training was composed of four parts, all under Regular Education Inservice Training of Regular Education Personnel (REP) who would work with mainstreamed handicapped children. Training was divided into: 30 hours of training seminars; monthly follow-up meetings; on-site visits by project staff; and individual and small group study to view non-print instructional materials.

Training seminars. Seminars were held on five Saturdays in October and November from 9:00 to 12:00 Noon and 1:00 to 4:00 P.M. for a total of 30 hours. Meetings were held on the campus of the Brooklyn Center of Long Island University. In order to reinforce the learnings and activities that occurred during the intensive five-week course, follow-up training seminars were held once each month (Tuesdays, 3:30 - 5:30 p.m. from November to May) for a total of 14 additional contact hours. These monthly seminars

took place while the project participants were working with mainstreamed children. Thus, didactic and experimental learnings could interact creating a learning experience that parallels a practicum arrangement but involves in fact, a real, rather than a contrived, educational experience.

The Saturday lecture-discussion experiential classes allowed participants to earn three graduate credits for successful completion of the course. In addition, participants were given a stipend of $15.00 for each session attended and $15.00 also was paid for attendance at each of the monthly seminars.

Participants were expected to keep a log of the material covered in the training seminars, which was then integrated with a monthly report of a "critical incident" in the participant's work with a handicapped youngster. This log served as a source of information for the participants while they worked with handicapped children in the school setting. After the log had been checked by the Project Director and Co-Director, it was returned to the participant. The course was offered on a pass-fail or letter grade based upon an examination, completion of the log, and supervised on-site visits.

Training seminars covered a wide range of topics dealing with the handicapped and were conducted by a number of specialists in the field. A detailed description of training content is provided below:

Session I: Introduction and Overview, October 20, Morning and Afternoon. Introductions were made by Dr. Janet Finell,

Project Director. The principal speaker of the overview session was Professor Joseph Paladino, Guidance Supervisor, District 13.

This workshop addressed the legislative background in which changes in the educational philosophy regarding the handicapped have occurred. PL 94-142, Chapter 853 of the New York State Education Law, and the Commissioner's Regulations and their implications and mandates were discussed.

Special education services in District 13 were reviewed and criteria for mainstreaming handicapped youngsters were discussed. Reference was made to an excellent source book developed by the Division of Educational Planning and Support, Board of Education of New York City, Creating Least Restrictive Learning Environments: A Guide for Mainstreaming. This publication, which was distributed to all participants, covers topics including "Preparing for Change," "Activities for Change," "Designs for Change," "Who is the Disabled Child?: Characteristics and Strategies," as well as a section on "Methods, Materials and Techniques in Special Education." This book also contains an excellent bibliography and a listing of advocacy sources and organizations serving the handicapped in New York City.

Also discussed were the roles of various school personnel in working with the handicapped child. Thus, the role of the principal, the counselor, the school psychologist, the special education teacher, the social worker and the regular classroom teacher were considered. A teamwork approach to mainstreaming was stressed with a consideration of how lines of communication between the special

and regular education teachers can be developed in District 13.

In this overview session, eight levels of special education services were reviewed which covered the following categories ranging from most to least disabling conditions: hospital based instruction, homebound instruction, full-time special class, part-time special class, regular class attendance plus supplementary instructional services, exceptional children in regular classes with or without supportive services and, finally, the prevention of handicapped behavior (from Board of Education Publication: Creating Least Restrictive Environments, 1977-78 Series, p. 9). The desirability of mainstreaming, as well as the ways it can best be implemented, were considered in this workshop.

Session II: Attitudes Toward the Handicapped; October 27, Morning and Afternoon. Professor Robert Nathanson, C.S.W., Director of Special Education Services at the Brooklyn Center, led two sessions on attitudes toward the handicapped.

The Special Education Services Division was the site for part of this workshop. Participants met, interacted with, and saw the special resources of the Division of The Brooklyn Center that services the handicapped college students. Disabled college students, graduates of the New York City school system, participated in these workshops and provided their perspectives in the discussions.

This workshop focused on the feelings and thoughts of participants, and on the resulting verbal and nonverbal behaviors that may be communicated by these school personnel to disabled

students with whom they work. Utilizing role playing techniques, a social distance exercise, and classroom discussion, the workshop was designed to enable participants to take an honest look at their attitudes toward persons, and particularly students, who are disabled.

Attention also was given to the attitudes of the non-handicapped classmates of the mainstreamed children. At the October 12th planning session, parents of exceptional children expressed great concern about the possible ridicule their children may receive in regular classes. They reported incidents of ridicule in the past by non-handicapped schoolmates. It was anticipated that participants would learn techniques in this seminar which they can use in their school situation, i.e., role playing, to facilitate the acceptance of handicapped children by their peers.

The objective of the workshop was to enable school personnel to become aware of their attitudes and behaviors, to provide them with techniques to use with their students, to let them know that it is all right to be afraid and uncomfortable about disability, but at the same time to prevent their attitudes and behaviors from further handicapping those who are already handicapped.

Session III: Curriculum and Resources, November 3, Morning and Afternoon. Mr. Bernard Zemsky, Guidance Consultant, Division of Special Education and member of the Executive Board of Guidance Couselors of the United Federation of Teachers, led this workshop on curriculum and resources.

Utilizing the least restrictive environment concept as a base, the basic philosophy of integration into the mainstream was

explored, and an overview of all handicapping conditions was reviewed. Alternative programs and environments which serve as country-wide models were presented.

Special scheduling, problems of classroom teachers, provision of materials, and work of itinerant personnel were discussed.

Mr. Zemsky distributed to participants guides and curriculum materials geared to the integration of handicapped children.

The approach in the workshop was problem-oriented. Mr. Zemsky also discussed difficulties with the current Committee on the Handicapped evaluation process, as well as the Isaac Lora case.

Session IV: Screening, Evaluation and Early Identification of the Exceptional Child; November 10, Morning. This workshop was led by Dr. Ira Janow, Coordinator of Clinical Guidance Services for the non-public schools. Topics covered in this workshop included screening, identification and evaluation of the exceptional child. Special attention was given to the identification of physical, intellectual, emotional and social disabilities in early childhood. Techniques to identify the exceptional child were covered. Under the umbrella category, including the physically, intellectually, emotionally and socially handicapped child, were categories such as poor eye-hand coordination, motor-physical disturbances, inappropriate behaviors, and signs of possible mental disease. In order to identify and understand pupil evaluations, a variety of instruments were used. This workshop gave participants the opportunity to familiarize themselves with evaluative tools, particularly culture-fair tests. Participants were trained in techniques to identify

deviations from what would be generally described as normal development in children. Cues leading to discovery of deviant development were discussed, and sources of referral and assistance for the special-needs child were covered. The issue of confidentiality of students' records was covered.

Session IV: The Individual Education Plan; November 10, Afternoon. Dr. Gary S. Belkin, Associate Professor of Guidance and Counseling at The Brooklyn Center, led this workshop on the use of the Individual Education Plan for the exceptional child. PL 94-142 mandates that no more than 30 days after entering the program, children in special education programs have prepared for them an Individual Educational Plan that includes a statement of present levels of educational performance, annual and short term instructional goals, and services and materials to be provided to the child. In addition, the extent to which the child will be able to participate in regular education programs and criteria for evaluating whether instructional objectives are being achieved are to be included.

Dr. Belkin discussed ways of implementing the goals of the I.E.P., and explained ways of presenting it to parents and involving them in the planning process.

Finally, the role of the I.E.P. for the fully or partially mainstreamed child was considered, and the role of the regular educator in implementing and/or maintaining it was discussed.

Session V: Working with Parents of Exceptional Children; November 17, Morning. Janet Finell, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Guidance and Counseling at The Brooklyn Center, led this workshop

on working with parents of exceptional children.

Of primary importance was the issue of parental feelings about and attitudes toward having a handicapped child. Dr. Finell described parental behavior toward the child which may include overprotectiveness, denial, anger and rejection or healthy acceptance of the child's strengths and limitations combined with respect for and encouragement of the child's autonomy. The effects of parental attitudes and behavior on the child were discussed. Participants role played the child as well as the parents and the school personnel working with exceptional children and parents.

It was stressed that of particular importance is the need to avoid blaming the parents for not being "perfect" parents of the exceptional child. It was hoped that participants would gain an understanding of the often conflicting feelings of the parents as well as their own feelings toward the child and the home situation.

The role of the principal, counselor and teacher in working with the exceptional child's parents were studied. In addition, a teamwork approach with parents of exceptional children and the New York State publication, Your Child's Right to An Education, A Guide for Parents of Handicapped Children in New York State was distributed to all participants.

Lists of sources of referral for community services for exceptional children and their parents were distributed.

Ways of setting up and conducting parent workshops were

covered as well as ways of enlisting the trust, cooperation and support of the parent in the child's educational and social development.

A guest speaker at this meeting was Denise Figueroa, Activist in Center for Independence of the Disabled in New York, herself a disabled graduate of the New York City public school system. Mrs. Figueroa discussed how school personnel can gain the cooperation and provide necessary support to parents of exceptional children.

Session V: Physical Bases; November 17, Afternoon. Professor Jeffrey Lambert, Associate Director of The Brooklyn Center's Special Educational Services Program for disabled students led this workshop on physical bases.

This workshop was designed to familiarize participants with the medical aspects and implications of several important and disabling conditions such as mental retardation, learning disability, visual impairment, deafness, and cerebral palsy. Common problems related to these disabilities were discussed, but it was emphasized that each individual's adjustment to disability is unique and often has little relationship to the type or extent of the particular disabling condition.

It was pointed out that if participants have factual information about disabilities, they will have lowered anxiety regarding disabled students students who may be mainstreamed into their classrooms. Attention was given to specific materials, methods and community resources which may assist educational personnel.

Adaptive equipment, means of procuring it, its application in the classroom, and its potential use for the student in a variety of settings was discussed.

A discussion and a question and answer session followed all of the formal presentations in the training seminars.

Monthly Follow-Up Seminars

Subsequent to the five all-day training seminars, participants met with the project director and co-project director once each month. The first meeting was held in November, and the meetings continued through May, 1980, for a total of 7 meetings. These meetings were held at the Brooklyn Center campus from 3:30 - 5:30 P.M. At these workshops, participants had the opportunity to discuss specific problems, issues and concerns that arose in their work with handicapped children.

Different special educators from District 13 were invited to participate in these once-a-month meetings. The purpose of inviting District 13 special educators was to give regular and special educators in District 13 the opportunity to open up lines of communication. In these workshops, partially or fully mainstreamed children known to both special and regular educators were discussed, with the goals in mind of gaining a perspective on their special needs, learning of the special curriculum and resources that have been utilized by them, and coordinating the education of children who are partially mainstreamed. Moreover, District 13 special educators were able to share their expertise with the regular

educators. It was hoped that these meetings would bridge the gap between the two groups of personnel and open lines of communication which would continue after the workshops ended. In this way, the expertise of the special educator would be available to the regular educator.

In addition to the above function of the monthly workshop, participants had the opportunity to get feedback, advice and information on special problems that may have arisen in their work with handicapped children. Curricular information, sources of referral, available community resources, special problems arising with parents, and other topics were discussed. When necessary, one or more of the specialists who spoke at one of the training seminars was invited to return to address themselves to the special problems. In summary, this aspect of the training consisted of on-the-job experience and group supervision provided by the project director and co-director. These meetings also were aimed at opening lines of communication between special and regular educators, and addressed specific problems that arose in participants' work with mainstreamed children.

On-Site Visits to Partcipants

With the aims in mind of providing participants with individual consultation in their school settings, the third aspect of the training involved two visits to each participant by the project director, Dr. Janet Finell, project co-director, Robert Nathanson, or trainer Jeffrey Lambert. During these visits, time was set aside to observe the exceptional child in the classroom,

counseling session or other appropriate school setting if so desired by the participant. The on-site consultants and the participants discussed such factors as classroom management, special administrative arrangements, peer acceptance, parental involvement, and curricular modifications. Each participant was visited twice in his/her school during the 1979-1980 school year. One visit was made between September, 1979 and January, 1980; and one was made between February and May of 1980.

Individualized and Small Group Study

Each project participant was encouraged to augment his/her classroom learning with individualized and small group study of nonprint materials available through Long Island University's Media Library. These materials, developed by the Special Learning Corporation, Guilford, Connecticut, enabled teachers, counselors, administrators, and other educational personnel to develop a clearer understanding of the Individualized Education Plan (IEP), and focused on the process of mainstreaming, from preparation for the handicapped child's entrance into the regular classroom through preparation for an independent life outside of the mainstreamed educational setting.

In addition, a training module was prepared at minimal cost to the project. Utilizing a portable videocassette recorder in conjunction with Long Island University's own audio-visual equipment, the university's video production technicians, at no cost to the Project, loaned their expertise and assisted the project in preparing the following module to further augment the training of project participants:

Three classroom situations were videotaped for a tape titled, "Methods and Materials that Work." One situation involved a class for Trainable Mentally Retarded children. Here, the project staff worked all year with the first grade class of a project participant to plan an assembly production on the theme, "Famous Black Americans." Rehearsals were taped which showed the positive interaction between regular first grade students and retarded students.

The second class situation focused on a mainstreamed hearing impaired student. One of the trainers from the project taught sign language to some of the other students in the class. At a later session, a deaf college student also taught sign language to students. The deaf mainstreamed child expressed her delight that other children were learning sign language, as well as becoming more sensitive to her special needs.

In the third situation, a teacher was shown preparing her regular class students for the arrival of a mainstreamed child.

Evaluation

Methodology

The evaluation design for this project included several methods of collecting data to assess the influence of training on participants, mainstreamed children and the educational system within District 13. While, for the most part, evaluation was focused on the collection of quantitative data through several measurement instruments, qualitative data also were collected by project staff who recorded their observations during site visits

to the schools.

Quantitative data. Data collection instruments used in this evaluation are described below:

1) Evaluations of Project Participants on Attitudinal Measures.

In order to determine the impact of the project on attitudinal change, participants were administered two scales: one instrument measuring attitudes toward the handicapped, and one instrument measuring attitudes toward the school placement of the handicapped. The scales used are the Attitudes Toward Handicapped Individuals (ATHI) (See Appendix) which is a 20-item Likert type scale adapted by Lazar, Stodden and Sullivan (1976) from the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons Scale (Yuker, Block and Young, 1966). This 6-point scale measures attitudes of acceptance or rejection toward all categories of handicapped individuals and was found to have a test-retest coefficient of reliability of.732 over a two-week period. This reliability coefficient is significant at the.01 level. The other scale used to measure attitudes concerning placement of children by school personnel is the Rucker-Gable Educational Programming Scale (RGEPS) (Rucker and Gable, 1974). (This scale is copyrighted and therefore not produced here.) The RGEPS consists of 30 short descriptions of handicapped children who are referred for special education services. The categories of handicapping include the learning disabled, mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed. Respondents are asked to indicate what they consider to be the appropriate educational placement for each

child on a continuum from least to most restrictive setting. The authors note that scores on this scale can be considered a measure of the social distance respondents wish to maintain between themselves and handicapped students. The split-half internal consistency reliability coefficient for the entire scale was found to be .86. The RGEPS produces 14 subscale scores: Attitudes toward Mental Retardation; Attitudes toward Emotional Disturbance; Attitudes toward Learning Disabilities; Knowledge of Mental Retardation; Knowledge of Emotional Disturbance, Knowledge of Learning Disabilities; Attitudes toward Mild Handicaps; Attitudes toward Moderate Handicaps; Attitudes toward Severe Handicaps; Knowledge of Mild Handicaps; Knowledge of Moderate Handicaps; Knowledge of Severe Handicaps; Total Attitudes, and Total Knowledge.

These two scales which together cover all categories of handicapping conditions, but measure attitudes from different perspectives, were administered twice: once before the start of the training seminars, and once in May, 1980 after participants were working with handicapped students for 9 months and receiving the follow-up training. The criteria utilized to evaluate the results of the project were significant changes in scores on the attitude scales at the two different times of testing.

The research hypothesis may be stated as follows: it was predicted that attitudes toward the handicapped would

become significantly more positive (at the .05 level or better) as a result of 30 hours of training, 9 months of working with handicapped students, participation in monthly seminars, and receiving on-site individual consultation.

While it would have been desirable to compare the project (experimental) group with a control group, several factors made this impossible. A legitimate comparison of experimental and control scores would necessitate random assignment of subjects to experimental and control groups. While this is feasible in a laboratory setting, it is not in the school setting. Moreover, obtaining a comparable control group which did not participate in the project but worked with handicapped students was considered an untenable practice by District 13 administrators.

2) Evaluating Participants' Development As Measured by Principals' Ratings of Participants' Schools

In order for this program to be effective, it should be able to have an effect throughout the entire school. Since the children involved in mainstreaming are going from segregated to integrated educational settings, the impact of this change should be felt on the school as a whole. One important outcome would be acceptance by non-handicapped students of schoolmates with disabilities. In addition, the extent to which the work with project participants has had a radiation effect upon the entire school should be assessed

through testing.

Eric Ward, Research Associate in District 13, prepared the Principals' Rating Scale with consideration of the need to avoid conflicts with the contractual regulations of the United Federation of Teachers of New York City regarding supervisory ratings of school personnel. In addition, the design of this scale includes attention to the avoidance of potential conflicts between District 13 teachers and counselors, and supervisory personnel. Therefore, to pick up the radiation effect and to avoid possible staff conflicts, evaluation of the entire school rather than individual participants was performed. The scale was filled out by principals of schools in which participants work. Ratings were made in early September and again in May. A copy of the scale is included in the Appendix.

Principals' ratings were quantified according to the following categories: no change, positive change, and negative change.

3) Parental Ratings of Mainstreaming and Their Children's Experiences

The scale to measure changes in handicapped students served by this project was developed by Professor Jeffrey Lambert, Associate Director of Special Education Services at The Brooklyn Center, and was available to parents of mainstreamed handicapped children in both Spanish and English. Parents were asked to fill out this form in September, 1979 and in May, 1980 and to rate their children

in such areas as attitudes toward school, treatment by school personnel, future school placement of child, and acceptance by non-handicapped peers. While it was hoped that a reasonably large number of parents would be able to meet this evaluatory requirement, those parents who needed assistance were offered the help of school personnel or project staff. These ratings were to be quantified to determine whether or not positive change, negative change or no change has occurred as measured by parents' perceptions in September and May. A copy of this scale can be found in the Appendix.

4) Measure of Participants' Work With Handicapped Students.

This scale, developed by the Project Director, calls for ratings on a 4-point scale of the mainstreamed child's adjustment, peer acceptance and parental cooperation (see Appendix). This scale was administered in December and again in May. Responses were quantified according to degree of change.

5) Participants' Ratings of the Project

Two questionnaires were prepared by the Project Director to be used for participants' ratings (see Appendix). The first measured the degree to which each of the training activities was found to be helpful in preparing participants for their work with handicapped students, and asks for comments or suggestions. Each activity is rated on a 4-point scale. This questionnaire was administered in May. Responses were categorized according to the rating for each training activity.

In the second questionnaire (see Appendix), participants indicated the degree to which they had been helped by each project component and also were asked to provide an overall rating for their year-long experience. Ratings were made on a 4-point scale and are categorized by item.

Qualitative data.

Qualitative data were drawn from the observations of project staff during training sessions and on-site visits.

Results.

Quantitative data. Results of data analyses of the various measurement instruments used in this evaluation are reported below. It should be noted that sample size may vary for each measure.

1) Evaluations of Project Participants on Attitudinal Measures.

A) Attitudes Toward Handicapped Individuals (ATHI)

A significant difference between pre- and post-test scores was found on the ATHI scale indicating that project participants displayed significantly more positive attitudes toward handicapped individuals at the end of the project year. Results are summarized below:

TABLE 1

Differences Between Mean Pre- and Post-test Scores on the ATHI

ATHI	Mean	N	t
pre	77.04	25	5.53**
post	89.60		

* p < .01

B) Ruker-Gable Educational Programming Scale (RGEPS)

No significant differences were found between pre- and post-test scores on the RGEPS. However, a number of significant differences were discovered when RGEPS scores were run against participants' ratings of the project. These data are reported below. Note that a lower score indicates a more positive attitude toward placement of handicapped children in a less restrictive environment.

TABLE 2

Participants Ratings of Project on Experience with Mainstreamed Children vs. Post-Test Scores on Attitudes toward Mental Retardation

Project Rating	Mean	N	F
Excellent	26.29	7	
Good	30.92	13	3.95*
Fair/Poor	34.33	3	

* $p < .05$

Table 2 above indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on their experience with mainstreamed children also tended to have more positive attitudes on the post-test RGEPS measure regarding placement of mentally retarded children.

TABLE 3

Participants Ratings of Project on Experience with Mainstreamed Children vs. Post-Test Scores on Knowledge of Emotional Disturbance (See next page)

TABLE 3

Project Rating	Mean	N	F
Excellent	4.14	7	
Good	4.51	13	5.66**
Fair/Poor	2.73	3	

**$p < .01$

Table 3 indicates that participants who rated the project as Excellent or Good on their experience with mainstreamed children tended to have lower scores on knowledge of emotional disturbance.

TABLE 4

Participants Ratings of Help Received
from Media Materials vs. Post-Test Scores
on Attitudes toward Mild Handicaps

Project Rating	Mean	N	t
Excellent	36.80	10	2.95**
Good/Fair/Poor	43.64	14	

** $P < .01$

Table 4 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on help they received from media materials tended to hold more positive attitudes toward the placement of mildly handicapped students.

TABLE 5

Participants Ratings of Help Received
from Media Materials vs. Post-Test Scores
in Attitudes toward Severe Handicaps

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	10.70	10	2.04*
Good/Fair/Poor	13.50	14	

* $p < .05$

Table 5 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on help they received from media materials tended to hold more positive attitudes toward the placement of severely handicapped students.

TABLE 6

Participants Ratings of Help Received
from Media Materials vs. Post-Test Scores
on Attitudes toward Mental Retardation

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	26.10	10	3.62**
Good/Fair/Poor	32.36	14	

** $p < .01$

Table 6 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on help they received from media materials tended to hold more positive attitudes toward the placement of mentally retarded children.

TABLE 7

Participants Ratings of Help Received
from Media Materials vs. Post-Test Scores
on Attitudes toward Emotional Disturbance

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	40.60	10	2.40*
Good/Fair/Poor	48.14	14	

* $p < .05$

Table 7 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on help they received from media materials tended to hold favorable attitudes toward the placement of emotionally disturbed children.

TABLE 8

Participants Ratings of Help Received
from Media Materials vs. Post-Test Scores
on Total Attitudes

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	107.50	10	2.34*
Good/Fair/Poor	122.36	14	

* $p < .05$

Table 8 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on help they received from media materials tended to hold overall more favorable attitudes toward the placement of handicapped children.

TABLE 9

Participants Ratings of Help Received
from Media Materials vs. Post-Test Scores
on Knowledge of Moderate Handicaps

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	4.03	10	3.04**
Good/Fair/Poor	5.25	14	

** $p < .01$

Table 9 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on help they had received from media materials tended to have higher scores on knowledge of moderate handicaps.

TABLE 10

Participants Ratings of Help Received
from Media Materials vs. Post-Test Scores
on Knowledge of Severe Handicaps

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	1.98	10	3.17**
Good/Fair/Poor	3.00	14	

** $p < .01$

Table 10 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on help they received from media materials tended to have higher scores on knowledge of severe handicaps.

TABLE 11

Participants Ratings of Help Received
from Media Materials vs. Post-Test Scores
on Knowledge of Mental Retardation

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	2.81	10	4.23**
Good/Fair/Poor	4.20	14	

** p < .01

Table 11 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on help they received from media materials tended to have higher scores on knowledge of mental retardation.

TABLE 12

Participants' Overall Rating of
the Project vs. Post-Test Scores
on Attitudes toward Mental Retardation

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	27.50	12	2.10*
Good/Fair/Poor	31.55	11	

* p < .05

Table 12 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively overall tended to have more favorable attitudes toward the placement of mentally retarded children.

TABLE 13

Participants Ratings of Project Overview Session vs. Post-Test Scores on Attitudes toward Moderate Handicaps

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	66.73	11	2.06*
Good/Fair/Poor	59.92	13	

* $p < .05$

Table 13 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on the project overview session tended to hold less favorable attitudes toward the placement of children with moderate handicaps.

TABLE 14

Participants Ratings of Project Overview Session vs. Post-Test Scores on Attitudes toward Severe Handicaps

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	14.27	11	2.69*
Good/Fair/Poor	10.69	13	

* $p < .05$

Table 14 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on the project overview session tended to hold less favorable attitudes toward severe handicaps.

TABLE 15

Participants Ratings of Project Overview
Session vs. Post-Test Scores
on Attitudes toward Learning Disabilities

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	44.36	11	2.72*
Good/Fair/Poor	38.92	13	

* p .05

Table 15 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on the project overview session tended to hold less favorable attitudes toward learning disabilities.

TABLE 16

Participants Ratings of Project Overview
Session vs. Post-Test Scores
on Total Attitudes

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	124.18	11	2.31*
Good/Fair/Poor	109.38	13	

* p .05

Table 16 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on the project overview session tended to hold less overall favorable attitudes toward the placement of handicapped children.

TABLE 17

Participants Ratings of Attitudinal Factors Session vs. Post-Test Scores on Total Knowledge

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	6.37	16	2.86**
Good/Fair/Poor	7.46	8	

** $p < .01$

Table 17 indicates that participants who rated the project more favorably on the attitudinal factors session tended to have higher scores on total knowledge of handicaps.

TABLE 18

Participants Ratings of Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Session vs. Post-Test Scores on Knowledge of Mental Retardation

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	2.75	4	2.40*
Good/Fair/Poor	3.79	20	

* $p < .05$

Table 18 indicates that participants who rated the project more favorably on the IEP session tended to have higher scores on knowledge of mental retardation.

TABLE 19

Participants Ratings of Individual Educational Plan (IEP) Session vs. Post-Test Scores on Total Knowledge

Project Ratings	Mean	N	t
Excellent	5.50	4	2.84*
Good/Fair/Poor	6.98	20	

* p .05

Table 19 indicates that participants who rated the project more positively on the IEP session tended to have higher scores on total knowledge of handicaps.

2) Principals' Ratings of Participants' Schools.

Responses were received from 9 schools in the District with participants in the training program. The responses of these principals are given below for each item, by pre- and post-test. Also provided is the percentage of responses changing to more positive perceptions from the pre- to post-test period.

1. To what extent do classroom teachers in your school plan for the special needs of handicapped children?

	Pre	Post	
Not at all	0	0	
Minimally	6	1	89% more positively on post-test
Moderately	3	1	
Substantially	0	7	

2. To what extent is your school prepared to include handicapped pupils in regular programs?

	Pre	Post	
Not at all	2	0	
Minimally	1	0	44% more positive on post-test
Moderately	3	4	
Substantially	3	5	

3. To what extent are parents of handicapped children in your school participating in parent activities with parents of non-handicapped pupils?

	Pre	Post	
Not at all	2	1	
Minimally	5	1	67% more positive on post-test
Moderately	1	5	
Substantially	1	2	

4. To what extent are you familiar with the needs of handicapped pupils in regular classrooms?

	Pre	Post	
Not at all	0	0	
Minimally	2	0	33% more positive on post-test
Moderately	3	2	
Substantially	4	7	

5. To what extent are non-handicapped students accepting fellow students who are handicapped?

	Pre	Post	
Not at all	2	0	
Minimally	0	0	67% more positive on post-test
Moderately	5	2	
Substantially	2	7	

3) Parental Ratings of Mainstreaming and Their Children's Experiences.

It was not possible to obtain a sufficient number of responses from parents of mainstreamed children in order to analyze data from this questionnaire.

4) Measure of Participants' Work with Handicapped Students

Data were obtained on a total of 37 children at the pre-test period and 22 children at the post-test period. Not all of the children were measured at both the pre- and post-test. For this reason, this measure may be assessing change in how teachers perceive their work with mainstreamed handicapped children more than change in specific children.

1. Adjustment to mainstreamed class.

	Pre		Post		Change
	N	%	N	%	
Excellent	2	5.4	5	22.7	+ 17.3%
Good	17	45.9	11	50	+ 4.1%
Fair	10	27	5	22.7	- 4.3%
Poor	8	21.6	1	4.5	- 17.1%

2. Ability to keep up academically with other students in class.

	Pre		Post		Change
	N	%	N	%	
Excellent	1	2.7	4	18.2	+ 15.5%
Good	7	18.9	5	22.7	+ 3.8%
Fair	14	37.8	5	22.7	- 15.1%
Poor	15	40.5	8	36.4	- 4.1%

3. Acceptance by other students.

	Pre		Post		Change
	N	%	N	%	
Excellent	8	21.6	8	36.4	+ 14.8%
Good	12	32.4	9	40.9	+ 8.5%
Fair	15	40.5	5	22.7	- 17.8%
Poor	2	5.4	0	0	- 5.4%

4. Apparent acceptance of disability by handicapped child.

	Pre		Post		Change
	N	%	N	%	
Excellent	3	9.1	6	27.3	+ 18.2%
Good	15	45.5	10	45.5	0
Fair	9	27.3	5	22.7	- 4.6%
Poor	6	18.2	1	4.5	- 13.7%

5. Ability to participate in regular education activities.

	Pre		Post		Change
	N	%	N	%	
Excellent	1	2.7	4	18.2	+ 15.5%
Good	13	35.1	6	27.3	- 7.8%
Fair	9	24.3	9	40.9	+ 16.6%
Poor	14	37.8	3	13.6	- 24.2%

6. Level of cooperation of parents.

	Pre		Post		Change
	N	%	N	%	
Excellent	10	28.6	5	22.7	- 5.9%
Good	10	28.6	9	40.9	+12.3%
Fair	8	22.9	4	18.2	- 4.7%
Poor	7	20.0	4	18.2	- 1.8%

5) Participants' Ratings of the Project

Responses to the two questionnaires administered to the participants at the end of the project year are given below.

A) Ratings of Seminar Sessions

1. Overview: Background of mainstreaming in District 13; plans and procedures.

	N	%
Excellent	19	55.9
Good	14	41.2
Fair	1	2.9
Poor	0	0

2. AttitudinalFactors

	N	%
Excellent	23	67.6
Good	10	29.4
Fair	1	2.9
Poor	0	0

3. Curriculum and Resources

	N	%
Excellent	14	41.2
Good	16	47.1
Fair	3	8.8
Poor	1	2.9

4. Screening, evaluation and early identification

	N	%
Excellent	10	30.3
Good	18	54.5
Fair	4	12.1
Poor	1	3.0

5. The Individual Educational Plan

	N	%
Excellent	9	26.5
Good	19	55.9
Fair	5	14.7
Poor	1	2.9

6. Working with parents

	N	%
Excellent	11	33.3
Good	17	51.5
Fair	5	15.2
Poor	0	0

7. Physical factors in disability

	N	%
Excellent	3	23.1
Good	8	61.5
Fair	2	15.4
Poor	0	0

Participants' Comments

"I found the workshops very informative."

"Overview had to be frequently updated because of changes in citywide policies and procedures, but overall overview was excellent."

"The training seminars were extremely useful in keeping the classroom teacher abreast of current developments in mainstreaming. Discussions with the handicapped college students were especially good in changing attitudes about the appropriateness of including disabled students in regular classes."

"Based on the speed with which children I know have been processed and placed, I would say that at my school at least, it's a long, fragmented process even with supposed improvements. Two boys, certified at least a month ago, have not yet been placed."

"It was a real consciousness raiser! Thank you."

B) Ratings of Project Helpfulness.

1. Your experience in working with mainstreamed children

	N	%
Excellent	11	34.4
Good	15	46.9
Fair	5	15.6
Poor	1	3.1

2. Help you received from training seminars

	N	%
Excellent	20	60.6
Good	13	39.4
Fair	0	0
Poor	0	0

3. Help you received from the monthly follow-up sessions

	N	%
Excellent	18	56.3
Good	13	40.6
Fair	1	3.1
Poor	0	0

4. Help you recived from in-school visits and consultation from project staff members.

	N	%
Excellent	21	67.7
Good	7	22.6
Fair	3	9.7
Poor	0	0

5. Help you received from media materials.

	N	%
Excellent	12	36.4
Good	17	51.5
Fair	4	12.1
Poor	0	0

6. Overall assessment of the project's contribution to your work with handicapped children.

	N	%
Excellent	20	62.5
Good	12	37.5
Fair	0	0
Poor	0	0

Participants' Comments

"There should be a faster way for students to be evaluated so that we would know what disability we are dealing with."

"Students should be evaluated much more quickly. This fault does not lie with the school but with COH (Committee on the Handicapped.)"

"The program coordinator in my particular school should have all of the programs ready for the students in September. In this past school year, the schedules of the mainstreamed students were chaotic. I did not receive their names and schedules until I had made five requests. The nine children who were attending my classes on an irregular basis did not show up at all after two months. I was not informed about changes in the program when they were made."

Qualitative data. In addition to the data from the measurement instruments reported above, data based on observations of, and discussions with, classroom teachers were collected by project staff. These data provide, in anecdotal form, considerable

insight into the problems participants faced and the impact of training on dealing with these problems.

1) Training Seminars

"An impressive piece of role-playing occurred in the workshop on parents. The parts of teacher and parents were played by bilingual participants. Participants enacted meeting with a parent whose child will not be promoted. The teacher breaks the news to the parent. The parent pleads, sobs, and begs the teacher to promote the child. (This role playing is based on a real incident.)

Class discussion revealed the class' sensitivity to the teacher's rage at the mother. The teacher is trying to help the child but the mother seems to be undoing everything the teacher is doing. During the course of the role playing, the mother turned the discussion to herself. She (the mother) felt terrible. The focus turned to how terrible the mother feels rather than what the needs of the child were. This further enraged the teacher who has a relationship with the child but not with the mother. The teacher is not concerned about the mother's emotional needs. Her emotional reactions are geared to the child.

There is a breakdown in communication between the teacher and parent. The teacher does not realize that the mother is a very infantile woman who is emotionally incapable of caring for her child in an adult way. The mother sees the teacher a cruel and insensitive to her and her child. The mother sees her personal problems as primary as she herself is an emotional child.

Both players were bilingual. During the role playing,their interaction became so heated that they began yelling at one another in Spanish.

The incident illustrated to the class the strong emotions that come up when school personnel meet with a parent whose child they have worked with. It helped illustrate some of the dynamics between teacher and parent. The teacher essentially felt frustrated and enraged at the parent's failure to live up to her responsibility; the parent felt attacked and misunderstood. The lapse into Spanish in the role playing illustrated the importance of school personnel being able to communicate in parent's native language.

A better resolution of this not uncommon situation would have resulted if school personnel, teacher and counselor (ideally included later) could meet the mother's needs. Mother's support and cooperation is necessary. School personnel need to meet and recognize her emotional needs--she feels helpless and overwhelmed. Once her needs receive empathy and recognition, the mother can better focus on her child's needs."

"Over the year, students developed a real feel for mainstreaming. The original teacher cry was 'We want more special education services.' Innumerable complaints regarding lack of services from counselors to need for special classes, resource rooms, etc. Much time spent in addressing complaints re shortage of services, and other problems responsible for teacher's suffering. Teachers expressed feelings of being overburdened by: class size, difficult children, often uncooperative parents--in terms of not showing up for meetings, missing scheduled appointments with the Committee on the Handicapped and other services, not following up on teacher recommendations, sending children to school improperly cared for, etc., etc. Another area of complaint was the insensitivity of administration to teacher problems. With all this complaining and initially overwhelming resistance to mainstreaming, was growing acceptance that mainstreaming was the wave of the future.

Over the year, teachers, counselors and administrators participating in the course came to feel more and more prepared for mainstreaming. To quote Bernard Zemsky, guidance consultant of special education, union administrator and consultant speaker on the project: 'You may feel "whelmed," but the people who haven't had this training will feel overwhelmed.' (i.e. with the placement of more and more special education students in your classrooms).

Participants' comments at the conclusion of training reflected their immensely greater acceptance and lessened resistance to mainstreaming. They will be better able to communicate to their colleagues the advantage of integrating mildly handicapped students to their classes."

2) On-Site Visits

a) Problems confronting participants

"Participants' complaints that reports from the COH are not shared with them. Once child is referred, there is no feedback from counselor and COH which would permit teacher to learn what has been found. Teachers feel not treated as part of a team. Not treated as professionals."

"In this participant's class, large numbers of students have been certified or are potentially certifiable as handicapped. Aside from this project, no special provisions are made to help the teacher."

"With one of the participants, trainers suggested procedures for getting Hispanic parents to act on school's recommendation for work-up on hearing of child who suffers from chronic earaches and seems in danger of losing her hearing. Acted as a liaison between guidance supervisor and teacher so that action was taken."

"Many complaints by teachers when services they formerly had, i.e. resource room teacher, are lost. These complaints were taken up at monthly workshop with the District 13 guidance supervisor participating."

"Bilingual teacher--working with bilingually emotionally handicapped child. What was originally thought to be a language problem was actually emotional disturbance. Child unable to speak to teacher for fear of her as authority figure. In bilingual setting, child is accepted and eventually opens up to teacher. Child doing much better in bilingual class. Cried constantly in non-bilingual class."

"Participant--bilingual, 3rd-4th grade teacher. Works with boy who had multiple handicaps--learning and physical--has not yet been tested by COH because of difficulty of finding Spanish speaking psychologist--another typical Board of Education problem. When appointment was finally set up, mother failed to get there. Many school personnel workers--social worker, counselor, teacher herself--work to try to help mother meet appointments so that child can be properly diagnosed. This particular child had a serious accident at age 2 and apparently suffered brain damage. At later point in year, child was tested and found to be brain damaged by COH. Problems regarding transportation to school and placement are next issue with this case. Although this child is not in Ms. N's class, she treats him as her own student because he has a strong emotional attachment to her. Family also has an emotional attachment to her and appreciates her involvement. Teacher has accompanied mother to COH for testing."

"In one project school, several teachers work with C. who cannot be contained in a single classroom . C. is awaiting placement after being certified as emotionally handicapped. Students like this may be getting much more attention in mainstreamed situations than they would get in special education. In project course, teachers come to realize that this is so and students may be much better off in regular education settings."

"Another child who was found to be dyslexic is also getting more individual attention. COH came to school as part of new reorganization plan to test this child who is very bright but has no abstract or mathematical ability. He gets one hour a day of special tutoring from resource room teacher. Another example where mainstreaming is preferable to special education placement. Avoids the label of handicapped. Parent prefers it and teacher prefers it. Keeps child in reg. ed. setting with special services of resource room teacher. (Teacher was very upset when

resource room teacher's position had been lost for a few months. However, the position was eventually reinstated.)"

"Bilingual teacher complained when after a long wait, an emotionally handicapped child was finally given appointment for testing. Teacher was not told by counselor that a meeting was set up. Teacher would have tried to get mother to attend. Lack of coordination between teacher and counselor and COH. This type of issue was taken up a number of times at monthly seminars with guidance supervisor and plans were made to rectify it."

"During the year, several children were tested by COH and referred to special educ. classes. In cases where parents did not want their children labelled as handicapped, they moved and left no forwarding address. This was found to be true in many cases discussed during the project. Many parents do not want their children labelled and placed in special ed. and will move to avoid that occurrence."

"A bilingual child was beaten by mother for stuttering. Teacher and other school personnel finally managed to get mother to come to school. Parent was seen by Spanish speaking personnel who educated her that she should not beat for stuttering. Child will be taken to speech clinic by mother. Child is mainstreamed in class of a project participant."

"Teachers complain of feeling overwhelmed during on-site visits. Need more services. A number of teachers expressed appreciation in being able to share their sufferings. This was therapeutic for some. The opportunity to ventilate to a sympathetic listener helped them'get through the year.' Teacher of transitional (holdovers) class reported that this was her best year in many, because ofthe support she got from project trainer who visited her in her school, as well as the opportunities she had to ventilate in class."

"In a number of cases, when parents had the opportunity to choose special educ. versus continuation in mainstreamed setting, they chose the latter. Their child's teachers, project participants, apparently helped parent move in direction of mainstreaming."

"Some of the teachers reported the problem of children entering their class on a Monday morning without any prior notification about the youngsters and their special needs. A 7th grade history teacher said a number of kids just showed up for history, she didn't know anything about them; at a certain point they stopped coming and she didn't know why they stopped."

b) Examples of impact of the project on mainstreamed children, regular class children and other school personnel - the "Ripple Effect."

"In at least 5 schools, a project participant took responsibility for working with the school librarian to screen and order books dealing with the topic of disability. In each instance, on-site consultant furnished an article on how to screen for positive treatment of disability in children's books, as well as a recommended list of books."

"Mr. C., a 6th grade teacher, worked with B., a student in an HC 30 class diagnosed a learning disabled. B. was mainstreamed into Mr. C's class for science two afternoons a week. Three months prior to her graduation, Mr. C. began to feel that B. may be able to function in a regular junior high school class; however, it appeared that B. hadn't been re-evaluated in two years. Mr. C. felt it was particularly necessary to get an up-to-date evaluation of B's abilities since her family was planning to move down South and 'it wouldn't be fair to track B. where she doesn't belong.' Working along with Mrs. R., Assistant Principal also participating in the project, Mr. C. received assurance that B. would receive a re-evaluation prior to the close of the school year."

"Several participants took major role in Lora Decree Staff Development programs in their respective schools. Project learnings and A-V materials were utilized."

"Several participants coordinated film programs dealing with disability. Follow-up class discussion, and written composition were incorporated as means of exploring attitudes of non-disabled youngsters toward mainstreaming."

"Mrs. D., a regular first grade teacher, established a relationship between her class and a class of older (8-12) Trainable Mentally Retarded youngsters wherein they interacted around common activities, i.e. watching educational T.V., Halloween Party, making popcorn. Culmination of relationship between two classes was rehearsal and joint presentation of assembly program for entire school on topic of Famous Black Americans."

"As a result of project discussions, Spanish-English Bilingual Coordinator participating in project became more sensitive to fact that bilingual students taken out of bilingual classes and placed in special ed. classes were no longer receiving bilingual services. Working with the on-site consultant and the District Guidance Supervisor,

steps were taken to have itinerant bilingual services provided. In addition, all bilingual teachers and coordinators (7) participating in training were provided with copies of hispanic version of "Does Your Child Need Special Help in School?" and "Your Child's Right to an Education" and encouraged to distribute these as freely as possible within their respective schools."

"T. is a visually-impaired kindergarten student originally slated to be placed next September in a class for visually handicapped youngsters to which she would have to travel an inconvenient distance. As a result of her being mainstreamed in Mrs. R.'s science cluster throughout the year, T. 's regular kindergarten teacher began to take a fresh look at T.'s abilities and as a result, T. will continue in a lower first grade class in her neighborhood school, with appropriate support from a school-based support team program presently being implemented in New York City."

"Early in the 1979-1980 academic year, the on-site consultant visiting the elementary school of two project participants became alarmed over mainstreaming that was being done in very haphazard fashion with little regard for adequate selection of students to be mainstreamed, mainstream class situation, or preparation of student, classmates, and teachers. As a result Mrs. R., assistant principal participating in training, undertook a project wherein she was responsible for supervising a 5th grade teacher given release time to systematically identify handicapped youngsters in the school's HC 30 classes who are ready to be mainstreamed. The teacher then matches the students with a regularized classroom experience that best meets their needs, adequately prepares the handicapped students and the regular class for the students' arrival, and assures that the parents are notified and in agreement."

"Mrs. R., science cluster teacher, has developed such an interest in mainstreaming disabled students in science education that she has begun to volunteer her services at two nature centers near her home community with the goal of increasing the involvement of neighborhood disabled youngsters. The on-site consultant encouraged her use of Sourcebook--Science Education and the Physically Handicapped, published in 1979 by the National Science Teachers Assn., as an invaluable resource both in school and in community activities."

"Mrs. B., a regular first grade teacher was originally quite vocal about her 'uncomfortable' feelings around physically disabled students. She expressed difficulty treating these students as she would other students. As

her work with R., a multiply handicapped student, progresses, Mrs. B. began to ease up considerably to the point where she and her class began to treat the student as 'one of the guys.' In addition, Mrs. B. became aware of similar feelings and behaviors on the part of another teacher toward R., i.e. holding R.'s hand, and plans to informally talk with the teacher about the positives and negatives in this."

"To enhance positive attitudes toward handicapped children, Mrs. W. helped her sixth grade class develop three role-play situations involving reactions of 'able-bodied' children to 'handicapped' children. The role-play situations were based on suggestions made by the children, and most class members participated. After each role-play, Mrs. W. engaged the participants in discussion. She reached for attitudes and encouraged the children to put themselves 'in the shoes' of the handicapped child. The role-plays, which were videotaped for future instructional use, focused on blindness, amputation and minor orthopedic problems."

"To sensitize her class and facilitate the acceptance of a hearing-impaired child into a regular classroom setting, Ms. N. taught a unit on American Indian sign language. This was enthusiastically received by the class and led to a discussion about the sign language used today by people who are deaf. Two children in the class, one of whom is hearing-impaired herself, then created their own system of sign language, copies of which were made by Ms. N. and distributed to the class.

After discussing the sign language unit with Ms. N., I was asked to contine the unit by teaching some 'real' sign language to the class. I did this, and the enthusiasm displayed by the class was enormous. They learned at least fifteen signs and the manual alphabet (fingerspelling). We also talked about deafness and lesser degrees of hearing impairment.

A week or so after I taught sign language to Ms. N.'s class, she contacted me and indicated that the class, still very enthusiastic, had expressed an interest to learn more about deafness and sign language. In response to this, arrangements were made for the class to meet a deaf college student.

This session, also videotaped, was one of the most noteworthy of the Project. The session gave the children a unique opportunity to talk with and enjoy a person who, secondarily, happened to be deaf. The class asked wonderfully sensitive questions which were well answered. Again, the enthusiasm by the class was overwhelming. Ms. N. said this event was, easily, the year's most interesting and exciting event."

"Mr. D. provided G., an 'emotionally handicapped' child, with the opportunity of spending one hour each day with his class when they studied Social Studies. An outgrowth of this experience was that G. was invited to join the class on two out-of-school trips--to a museum , and to the circus. Mr. D. reported, with a degree of pride, that G.'s behavior was quite satisfactory, not different at all from the 'regular' class members.

I had the opportunity to meet with G.'s Special Ed. teacher. She believes the mainstreaming opportunity was extremely beneficial for G. and said she's noticed improvement in her general behavior."

"My work with one teacher focused on an important issue that receives very little attention--'burnout.' Ms. R., a fine teacher, was experiencing a crisis in her career. By giving her an opportunity to express some of her feelings, she was able to identify some of the specific factors which were bothering her. With this information, she was then able to take steps to resolve these problems. While I'm not sure what the final outcome will be, Ms. R. said that she found our sessions to be quite helpful. With the implementation of P.L. 94-142, regular classroom teachers are being asked to, in a sense, 'give more of themselves.' Since teachers have substantial feelings about this, a Project such as this should address these needs."

"As I was about to leave a school after visiting a Project participant, I noticed that the Principal was having great difficulty communicating with a parent who happened to be deaf. Since I am able to communicate in sign language, I offered my assistance. Acting as interpreter, I assisted the Principal in communicating with the parent around a problem her child was having. What had started out as an argument between the Principal and parent, ended amicably.

Afterwards, the Principal and I talked for a few minutes. She thanked me for my help and seemed to be sensitized by the experience. I suggested ways she might communicate with deaf people in the future (writing, etc.) and talked about the availability of sign language interpreter service. I also sensed that as a result of the experience, the Principal had gained an increased respect for the Project and its goals."

"A joint meeting was held between myself, a Project Participant and a Special Education teacher in this elementary school. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the progress of a mentally retarded child placed, an hour each day, in a regular classroom. The meeting was particularly beneficial since it 'spread' the Project's learning to another staff member in the school.

> After this consultation, the mainstreaming experience was modified to better serve the interests of the child. In this particular case, a program was designed to incorporate the child as a part-time 'helper' in the regular class. This was done as a step toward helping the child develop a better concept of self. It was particularly appropriate since the 'regular' class children were considerably younger and smaller in stature than the Special Ed. child."

Discussion

Data provided in the results section above indicate that this project had a significant impact on the attitudes of project participants, participants' work with mainstreamed children and participants' influence on other school personnel involved in mainstreaming. Some of these findings are summarized briefly below.

A significant difference was found between pre- and post-test scores on the Attitudes Toward Handicapped Individuals scale indicating more positive attitudes at the end of the project year. Additionally, a number of subscale scores on the Rucker-Gable Educational Programming Scale were found to relate to participants' ratings of the project. For the most part, higher ratings of the project were related to more favorable attitudes toward the placement of handicapped children in the least restrictive educational environment.

Principals' ratings of participants' schools were consistently higher at the post-test period. Change rates ranged from 33% more positive ratings on principals' familiarity with the needs of handicapped pupils in regular classrooms to 89% more positive ratings on classroom teachers' planning for the needs of handicapped children.

Participants' ratings of handicapped students in their classes also were more positive at the post-test period. Least change was noted in ratings of parent cooperation. Greatest change was observed in ratings of the mainstreamed child's acceptance by other students and adjustment to the mainstream class.

Participants' ratings of the seminar sessions tended to be very favorable. Ratings of "excellent" or "good" were given by 82.4% to 97.1% of the participants for the seven topics listed. The least highly rated sessions were on the Individual Educational Plan and Curriculum and Resources. The most highly rated sessions were the Project Overview and Attitudinal Factors.

Participants' ratings of the helpfulness of the project also were high. All participants rated the project as"excellent" or "good" in regard to the training seminars and their overall assessment of the project's contribution to their work with handicapped children. Lowest ratings were given to the project's helpfulness in experience in working with the mainstreamed child (81.3%).

Qualitative data based upon project staff's observations provided important insight into the problems faced by participants including the slowness with which children are evaluated and placed, lack of cooperation with the COH, lack of support services, need for more parent cooperation, and need for a greater number of bilingual teachers to work with bilingual handicapped children.

Finally, numerous examples were provided by project staff of the ways in which the project had affected the work of partici-

pants with mainstreamed children, their work with regular class children in accepting mainstreaming, and their interaction with other school staff.

REFERENCES

Chapin, R.C. The legal rights of children with handicapping conditions and the process of mainstreaming. Peabody Journal of Education, 1978, 56 (2), 18-23.

Cochrane, P.V. and Westling, D.L. The Principal and Mainstreaming: Ten suggestions for success. Educational Leadership, 1977, 34 (7), 506-511.

Fiske, B. Educating the disabled is something really special. The New York Times, Sunday, May 13, 1979, p. 8E.

Foster, J.C., Szoke, C.O. Kapisovsky, P.M. and Kriger, L.S., Guidance, Counseling and Support Services for High School Students with Physical Disabilities. Cambridge, Mass.: Technical Education Research Centers, Inc., 1977.

Goffman, E. Stigma. Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Greer, B.F. Attitudes of special education personnel toward different types of deviant persons. Rehabilitation Literature, 1975, 36, 182-184.

Guskin, S.L. Dimensions of judged similarity among deviant types. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1963, 68, 218-224.

Harasymiw, S.J. and Horne, M.S. Teacher attitudes toward handicapped children and regular class integration. Journal of Special Education, 1976, 10 (4), 393-400.

Hauser, C. Evaluating mainstream programs: Capitalizing on a victory. The Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13 (2), 107-128.

Hite, H. Inservice education: Perceptions, purposes and practices. In: Planning Inservice Teacher Education: Promising Alternatives. Published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. May, 1977.

Howey, K.R. A framework for planning alternative approaches to inservice teacher education. In: Planning Inservice Teacher Education: Promising Alternatives. Published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. May, 1977.

Irvin, T. Implementation of Public Law 94-142. Exceptional Children, 1976, 43 (3), 135-137.

Jones, J. Federal aid to states. Exceptional Children, 1976, 43 (3), 138-139.

Kirk, S.A. and Gallagher J. Educating Exceptional Children. Third Edition. Boston, Mass., Houghton Miflin Company, 1979.

Lazar, A.L., Stodden, R. L. and Sullivan, N.V. A comparison of attitudes held by male and female future school administrators toward institutional goals, personal adjustment, and the handicapped. Rehabilitation Literature, 1976, 37 (7), 198-201.

Martin, E.W. A Helping Relationship: Federal programs for special children. Exceptional Children, 1976, 43 (3) 132-135.

Martin, E. Mainstreaming as national policy. In P.H. Mann (Ed.), Shared responsibility for handicapped students: Advocacy and programming. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Training and Technical Assistance Center, 1976, pp. 13-15.

Meyen, E.L. Exceptional Children and Youth: An Introduction. Denver, Colorado: Love Publishing Company, 1978.

Middleton, E.J., Morsink, C. and Cohen, S. Program graduates' perception of need for training in mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 1979, 45, 256-261.

Murphy, A., Dickstein, J. and Drippes, E. Acceptance, rejection and the hearing handicapped. Volta Review, 1960, 62, 208-211.

Payne, J.S., Martin, W. and Stevens, B. Mainstreaming mentally retarded students in the public schools. Mental Retardation, 1979, 17, 45-47.

Phelps, L.A. and Halloran, W.D. Assurance for handicapped learners. American Vocational Journal, 1976, 51, 36-37.

Richardson, S.A., Hastorf, A.H., Goodman, N. and Dornbush, S.M. Cultural uniformity in reaction to physical disabilities. American Sociological Review, 1961, 27, 241-247.

Rucker, C.N. and Gable, R.K. Rucker-Gable Educational Programming Scale Manual. Storrs, Ct.: RG Associates, 1974.

Shaw, S.F. and Gillung, T.B. Efficacy of college course for regular-class teachers of the midly handicapped. Mental Retardation, 1975, 13 (4), 3-6.

The New York Times. Hispanic pupils hampered in tests tied to English ability. Sunday, September 16, 1979, p. 1,66

Umansky, W. and Cryan, R. Mainstreaming of young children: Unanswered questions. Childhood Education, 1979, 55, 189-191.

Warren, S.A. and Turner, D.R. Attitudes of professionals and students toward exceptional children. Training School Bulletin, 1966, 62, 136-144.

Wechsler, H., Suavez, A.C. and McFadden, M. Teacher attitudes toward the education of physically handicapped children. Journal of Education, 1975, 157 (1), 17-24.

Wright, B.A. Physical disability: A psychological approach. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.

Yarger, S.J. ISTE, Report IV, Creative Authority and Collaboration. Monograph on the Inservice Teacher Education Concepts Project, National Center for Education Statistics and the Teacher Corps. Palo Alto, Calif., 1976.

Yuker, H.E., Block, J. and Campbell, W.A. A scale to measure attitudes toward disabled persons. Albertson, New York: Human Resources Research Foundation, 1960. (Human Resources study #5).

Yuker, H.E., Block, J.R. and Young, J.H. The Measurement of attitudes Toward Disabled Persons. Albertson, New York: Human Resources Center, 1966. (Human Resources Study #7).

Yuker, H.E. Attitudes as determinants of behavior. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1965, 31, 15-16.

Zucker, S.H. and Meyer, E.L. Attitudinal stability of teachers of exceptional children. The Journal of Experimental Education, 1975, 43(3), 94-96.

APPENDIX

TO THE PRINCIPAL

Members of your regular classroom teaching staff, counselors, and other school personnel are participating in a program with The Brooklyn Center of Long Island University to train them to effectively include handicapped pupils in regular school programs.

Please complete the questions below based on an overall appraisal of your school.

Choose the number that best describes your response based on the following scale:

1 - Not at all
2 - Minimally
3 - Moderately
4 - Substantially

____ 1. To what extent do classroom teachers in your school plan for the special needs of handicapped pupils?

____ 2. To what extent is your school prepared to include handicapped pupils in regular programs?

____ 3. To what extent are parents of handicapped children in your school participating in parent activities with parents of non-handicapped pupils?

____ 4. To what extent are you familiar with the needs of handicapped pupils in regular classrooms?

____ 5. To what extent are non-handicapped students accepting fellow students who are handicapped?

Additional Comments or Suggestions for Effective Integration of Handicapped Students and Staff Preparation:

Dear Parent,*

Your child has been participating in a program designed to integrate him/her into the regular education program of his or her school. The directors of this program would like to evaluate its effect on your child. Therefore, we are asking you to fill out the enclosed questionnaire, and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. Your comments are very important in helping us to provide your child with the highest quality education.

Thank you for your assistance.

_____
Principal

*This scale will be distributed in Spanish and English and printed on the stationery of Community School District 13.

1. Have you noticed any changes in your child's attitude toward school?

Positive_____ Negative_____ Please Explain:

2. Did your child's teacher or other school personnel seem to be sensitive to his/her needs?

Yes_____ No_____ Please Explain:

3. Did you have an opportunity to meet with your child's teacher, counselor, or other school personnel? Were these meetings helpful?

Yes_____ No_____ Please Explain:

4. Do you think your child should continue in a regular class?

Yes_____ No_____ Please Explain:

5. Do non-handicapped children show more acceptance toward your child than they did in the past?

Yes_____ No_____ Please Explain:

Further comments or suggestions:

SCALE TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO PROJECT PARTICIPANTS FOR USE IN EVALUATING TRAINING SEMINAR ACTIVITIES

Please rate each project activity on the following scale in order to determine how helpful the training seminars were in preparing you to work with handicapped students in your class or school.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Overview: Background of mainstreaming in District 13; plans and procedures	___	___	___	___
2. Attitudinal Factors	___	___	___	___
3. Curriculum and resources	___	___	___	___
4. Screening, evaluation and early identification	___	___	___	___
5. The Individual Educational Plan	___	___	___	___
6. Working with Parents	___	___	___	___
7. Physical Factors in Disability				

Please list any comments or suggestions you may have regarding any or all of the workshops.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON PARTICIPANTS' RATINGS OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVICED, AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE PROJECT

School position of participant_____

Number of handicapped children served, 1979-1980_____

Types of handicaps being served_____

_____

Ages of children being served_____

CHECK THE RESPONSE THAT BEST DESCRIBES THE HANDICAPPED CHILDREN WITH WHOM YOU ARE WORKING AND THE ROLE OF THE PROJECT

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
1. Adjustment to mainstreamed class	___	___	___	___
2. Ability to keep up academically with other students in class	___	___	___	___
3. Acceptance by other students	___	___	___	___
4. Apparent acceptance of disability by handicapped child	___	___	___	___
5. Ability to participate in regular educational activities	___	___	___	___
6. Level of cooperation of parents	___	___	___	___
7. Your experience in working with handicapped children	___	___	___	___
8. Help you received from training seminars	___	___	___	___
9. Help you received from the monthly follow-up sessions	___	___	___	___
10. Help you received from in-school visits and consultation from project staff member	___	___	___	___
11. Help you received from media materials	___	___	___	___

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
12. Overall assessment of the project's contribution to your work with handicapped children	___	___	___	___

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE IN EITHER YOUR SCHOOL'S MAINSTREAMING PROGRAM OR IN THE PROJECT ITSELF:

NEW YORK POST, MONDAY, AUGUST 27, 1979, p. 33

Education 5

Wanted: Teachers for handicapped children

By Dina Greenfield

THE BUREAU of Education for the Handicapped, U. S. Office of Education, Washington D. C., has given grants of $100,000 to Hunter College of the City University of New York and $30,000 to Long Island University (SUNY) for the training of special education teachers.

But surprisingly, not enough teachers are taking advantage of these free tuition programs designed to help them deal with handicapped students who are now being "mainstreamed" into regular classrooms.

In 1975 the Federal Government passed Public Law 94-142, The Education For All Handicapped Children Act, which took effect in 1978, guaranteeing public school education to all children regardless of any physical or emotional handicap.

Minimally handicapped children are put into classes with normal students and the severely or multiple handicapped are being placed in new schools and classrooms designed to meet their individual needs.

Thus the need for more special education teachers.

As of June 1979, 6553 special ed teachers were employed in the New York City school system. This number is expected to rise to perhaps 7000 for the coming school year.

For the ninth consecutive year Hunter College has received a grant for the training of teachers of the severely multiple handicapped. This is the third year Hunter has received $100,000, but it is the first year that not enough students have enrolled in the program.

A total of 26 teachers can participate in this September to June program and will receive upon completion, a Masters Degree and state certification as Teacher of Special Education. Ten students are still needed to fill the program.

Included are two fellowships being offered in bilingual special ed.

For further information contact Dr. Rosanne K. Silberman, Hunter College of the City University of N. Y., Program in Special Education, 440 E. 26th St., New York, N. Y. 10010. Room 729.

Long Island University has received another grant of $30,000 from the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped, for an inservice training project.

Guidance counselors, administrators and teachers in School District 13 (in the Fort Green, Brooklyn area) who will be working with over 100 "mainstream" students for the first time this year, can receive three graduate credits by attending six classes on Saturday afternoons.

As an incentive, each time a teacher attends the session he/she will receive $14.

For further information contact Dr. Janet Finell, the project director, in the Department of Guidance and Counseling at Long Island University, 834 6000.

NOTE: Long Island University was erroneously listed as part of SUNY, and classes were listed as Saturday mornings. They are all day Saturday (6 hours).

From New York News, September 4, 1979

School staffers will train to aid handicapped pupils

Teachers and other school personnel from Brooklyn's School District 13 will receive special training this year to work with handicapped children who have been integrated into the school system.

A $30,000 Health, Education and Welfare grant, recently awarded to Long Island University's Brooklyn Center, will provide funds for training 35 educators from the district. District 13 covers the Bedford-Stuyvesant and Fort Greene areas.

The funding, to run from September 1979 through May 1980, will cover the cost of tuition for the participants, including teachers, guidance counselors and administrators, and of stipends, equipment and supplies.

District 13 trainees will work with over 100 "mainstreamed" handicapped children. These children are being integrated into the regular educational setting in accordance with the Federal Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975.

The program will include training seminars covering such topics as attitudinal factors, early identification and evaluation, working with parents, and developing curriculum and resources.

LIU Brooklyn Center educators and District 13 staff said they hoped the new program would have a positive effect on large numbers of personnel, parents and children, and that the 35 participants would serve as a training base for other educators in the future.

—Katharine Schaffer

Community School District 13
44 COURT STREET, BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11201
TELEPHONE: 834-6760, 1, 2

J. JEROME HARRIS, Ph.D.
COMMUNITY SUPERINTENDENT

HELEN GRIFFITHS
DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT

May 14, 1980

Dr. Edward A. Clark, President
The Brooklyn Center-Long Island University
One University Plaza
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear President Clark:

As the Long Island University/District 13 collaboration, "Institute For Mainstreaming Inner City Handicapped Youngsters" terminates for the current school year, I would like to share with you the overwhelmingly positive response expressed by the District's educational community. The participants, the school principals who supervise them, and various special educators have spontaneously communicated their enthusiasm regarding this very meaningful and productive contribution to staff development efforts within the District. In particular, the on-site visits by Drs. Finell, Nathanson, and Lambert were perceived as stimulating and of practical assistance in establishing the concept of mainstreaming. The participation of bi-lingual teachers was singled out as a strong point by those particularly concerned with the dearth of services for handicapped bi-lingual youngsters.

Participants were very emphatic regarding the superiority of the Institute in comparison with the Central Board's mandated Lora Decree Staff Development Program. In fact, participants in the Institute were utilized by the building principals as trainers and resource people in the sessions held for the complete school staff on December 3, 1979 and March 24, 1980.

My own frequent contacts with teachers and counselors who participated were most rewarding in that my supportive efforts apparently contributed to their positive experiences at the Brooklyn Center. May I quote one guidance counselor whose sentiments summarize the comments of many participants? She said:

> I applied for the Institute with some misgivings, wondering why I was giving up six whole Saturdays and those Tuesday afternoons. I'm glad I did, because this was just about the best in-service experience I've ever had. The Saturday sessions were so interesting the time just flew by.

As you may be aware, I was involved in the planning of the current proposal to expand the Institute to serve eight community school districts over the next three years. Teachers and counselors who had become aware of the Institute and interested in participating next year were also consulted in the planning. We are all strongly recommending that the Institute be funded again so that the training will enrich the professional development of many more participants. As in the past, Community School District 13 will provide complete support and involvement. Mrs. Helen Griffiths, Deputy Superintendent, has reiterated this committment of complete cooperation in her letter of October 9, 1979.

I look forward to a continuation of the mutually rewarding experiences which have characterized our past collaborations.

Very truly yours,

Joseph Paladino
Supervisor of Guidance

JP:el